

Annapolis Historic Preservation Commission

145 Gorman Street, 3rd Floor, Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Chartered 1708

410-263-7941 • 410-263-7961 • MD Relay (711) • FAX 410-263-1129

PUBLIC HEARING

STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Dated: May 9, 2016

Submitted by: Lisa Craig, Chief of Historic Preservation

Agenda #:New Business #3Meeting Date:May 10, 2016Property Address:243 Hanover Street

Landmark / **Historic District:** Colonial Annapolis National Historic Landmark District

Historic Status: Contributing

Applicant/Owner: Johnny Kallis / Daniel Farnoly

Contractor: Bohan Contracting, Inc.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Applicant is seeking approval to construct a 2nd story addition above the existing one-story rear addition. Cementious siding on the existing addition will be replaced with a wavy edge cedar siding. The same siding material will be used on the new addition. The non-historic vinyl windows will be replaced with wood windows. A balcony supported by posts will be constructed as an extension to the new rear 2nd floor addition.

BACKGROUND

Staff met with the applicant on numerous occasions to review the proposed building alterations. Staff met with the applicant to review the initial submission of the application for public hearing. Based on the discussion, additional supplemental information was provided as revisions to the application, specifically to address Staff's request for specificity in dimensions of windows, doors and siding and compliance with materials allowed under the guidelines.

EVALUATION

HPC and **Planning and Zoning (P&Z)** staff reviewed the application and approved the application as submitted commenting that both side yard setabcks for the addition are zero. However, the Critical Area Coordinator indicates "the survey with hatching and colored marking is unclear as to its intent. I would suggest that they submit a copy of the survey as is and then a copy of the survey with the new addition shown."

Department of Neighborhoods and Environmental Programs (DNEP) staff reviewed the application and requests revisions as follows:

1) Provide an actual surveyed site plan that dimensions all existing improvements, and locates all existing and proposed improvements on the property in reference to lot lines around landmarks. The real estate

- plat provided is insufficient and actually discusses the possibility of the existing structure being partially located on the adjacent properties.
- 2) The proposed cantilever of the second story addition may have to be reduced based on the information provided from an actual survey
- 3) The proposed 43.5" cantilever shall be engineered by a structural engineer licensed in the state of Maryland
- 4) The structural shall have full sprinkler protection
- 5) Any wall located less than five feet from and arallel to a lot line shall be a fire-rated assembly. Any wall located less than three feet from and parallel to a lot line shall not have fenestration.

The **HPC Consulting Architect** reviewed the application and provided comments under separate cover.

In evaluating the applicant's proposed scope of work for recommendation to the HPC, staff completed review of the application using relevant references from *Building in the Fourth Century: Annapolis Historic District Design Manual* (Design Guidelines) as highlighted below:

B.1 – Visual Relationships between the Old and New

A new building or addition should visually relate to contributing historic buildings in its immediate neighborhood... The "immediate neighborhood" is generally defined as at least ½ block in both directions.

B.2 - New Building Design

The design of new buildings and additions should be compatible with, but not imitate existing historic buildings.

B.4 - Relationship of Facade Parts to the Whole

All parts of a new building facade should be visually integrated as a composition which should relate to adjacent buildings. The size and proportions of facade elements such as doors, windows, cornices and water tables emphasize the vertical and horizontal dimensions of a facade.

B.6 - Size and Massing of Additions

Additions shall be design to be subordinate to the main part of the building in terms of massing, height, scale and detail.

B.11 - Building Widths and Spacing

The previaling relationships of building widths and the spaces between buildings should be respected and preserved. Where the space of buildings and side yards creates a rhythm, new buildings and additions to existing buildings should not alter that rhythm.

D.1 - Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (SOI Standards)

SOI #9 - New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destory historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

SOI #10 - New additions...shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environbemtn would be unimpaired.

D.3 – Preservation of Significant Original Features

Distinguishing original and historic features of historic buildings and their sites shall be preserved. These features include distinctive stylistic features, examples of skilled craftsmanship, and features such as original siding, roofing material, windows, and doors.

D.4 – Preservation of Historic Alterations

Significant changes to historic buildings and sites which have taken place over time are evidence of the history of the building. Changes which have achieved significance shall be preserved. However, removal of intrusive, insignificant alterations will be considered on a case by case basis.

D.6 – Missing and Deteriorated Components

Missing pieces and components of historic building features which cannot be repaired should be replaced with exact copies. Broken, missing or deteriorated portions of architectural features should be replaced with new materials that exactly replicate the original design of the feature. Where architectural elements... are missing, the replacement...should be appropriate to the style of architecture of the building.

D.10a - Roofing Materials - Additions

Roofing materials used on additions to historic buildings should be compatible with the materials used on the existing structure.

D.15 - Wall Siding and Trim

New replacement siding materials should be appropriate to the style of the building and consistent with existing buildings in the immediate neighborhood. Where the HPC determines that repair of existing siding is no longer feasible, replacement siding should replicate the existing materials. The siding used on additions should compliment the siding of the existing building.

D.16 - Historic and Replacement Windows and Doors

Existing inappropriate replacements for previously-removed features may be replaced with historically appropriate replicas. Vinyl and metal clad replacement windows are not permitted.

D.18 - Windows and Doors in Additions

Windows and doors in an addition to a historic building should relate to the scale and proportion of original openings in the existing building. Proposed sash patterns should repeat or be sympathetic to the sash pattern of the existing building.

D.24 - Porches on Additions and New Buildings

Proposed additions which include porches should be simple in design and related visually to the existing building and proposed addition.

D.28b - Additions

Materials used in building additions should be compatible with materials used on the existing building, and should be appropriate to the style and consistent with the character of the original building.

In reviewing the proposed scope of work, the relevant comments from P&Z and DNEP staff and the City's Consulting Architect, Staff would recommend that the Commission provide additional guidance to the applicant

as to the necessary evidence required to determine the project's compliance with the applicable HPC Guidelines. Staff's comments below should provide some clarity on needed supplemental documentation.

Staff finds the applicants proposal generally compliant with **Guidelines B.1, B.2, D.1, D.4, D.16 and D.28b** in visual relationships, differentiation, replacement of inappropriate elements and replacement materials.

While Staff supports the construction of a 2nd story addition over the existing 1st story addition as consistent with the above mentioned guidelines, the drawings do not show sufficient dimensions to determine compliance with **Guidelines B.4**, **B.6** and **B.11**. Because the drawings do not show detailed dimensions for building height, mass and design elements (siding, windows, porch) Staff is unable to clearly determine if the size and proportions of facade elements are relateable to adajcent buildings, are subordinate to the main building massing, height, scale and detail or if the addition's cantilever alters the relationship of the building widths and spacing with that of the adjacent "connected" property.

While Staff would support the use of wood siding for the new construction, consistent with **Guideline D.3 and D.15** Staff would recommend the applicant remove the asbestos siding on the rear addition to reveal any existing wood siding, repair rather than replace that siding, and then submit for Staff review and approval a wood siding product for the new 2nd story addition that is proportionate, yet differentiated from the original wood siding.

In addition, Staff would support the removal of non-compliant vinyl windows and replacement with wood windows sized appropriate to the historic windows. In order to determine compliance with **Guideline D.6** and **D.18**, Staff would request dimensional window details for any existing historic windows in order to determine if the replacement windows specified are dimensionally compatible.

While the use of a factory formed Galvalume roofing material is consistent with **Guideline D.10a** under a lenient standard of review, Staff is unclear as to the actual dimension of the proposed standing seam with one specification sheet showing a 1' height and another showing a 3/4" height. Staff would request clarification of the actual roofing profile to be used and confirmation as to how the ridge line will be treated since a projecting ridge cap is not consistent with Guideline D.10a.

There is insufficient detail in the drawings regarding dimensions, materials and design to allow Staff to comment on consistency of the new rear balcony construction with **Guideline D.24**.

RECOMMENDATION

HPC staff recommends a CONTINUANCE of the application to provide for HPC Staff and Commission consideration of additional evidence that can support how the project is compliant with Guidelines B.4, B.6, B.11, D.3, D.6, D.10a, D.15, D.18 and D.24. Such evidence would include:

- Dimensioned drawings for the affected elevations showing actual-sized and detailed openings (doors & windows), siding and additions (balcony & posts).
- Dimensional measurements for existing historic windows to be used as a basis for replacement of the vinyl windows.
- Photos and dimensions of the existing wood siding, if such exists, beneath the current asbestos siding.

Staff Report: 243 Hanover Street

- Clarification regarding the profile, ridge-line treatment and standing seam height for the proposed metal roofing.
- A boundary-survey site plan that provides actual dimensions of both the existing building in relationship to the site AND the dimensions of the proposed new addition, porch and cantilever to the site.
- Drawings to address the Consulting Architects request for additional details for HPC Staff review and recommendation to the Commission. This documentation must be provided to HPC Staff and the Consulting Architect no less than 15 days prior to the next HPC public hearing in order to allow the HPC Consulting Architect and DNEP project review Staff adequate time to determine preliminary compliance with HPC guidelines and building code.